

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant	City of Rancho Palos Verdes	Amount Requested	\$9,464,727
Proposal Title	San Ramon Canyon Stormwater Flood Reduction Project	Total Proposal Cost	\$18,929,455

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

One project is included in the proposal: San Ramon Canyon Stormwater Flood Reduction Project. The San Ramon Canyon Stormwater Flood Reduction Project will help achieve a number of the objectives of the Greater Los Angeles Area IRWMP. The project's primary objective is to manage stormwater runoff to reduce flood damage. In support of that objective, the project will also divert moderate and heavy stormwater flows away from highly-erodible canyon walls, which will reduce or eliminate undermining of an arterial roadway, reduce or eliminate sediment and debris transport onto a primary access road, and reduce or eliminate risk of mudflows (up to a 500-year event) through a mobile home neighborhood of 500 residents. The project will also improve stormwater runoff by routing "first flows" over existing natural streambeds, and it will restore habitat by protecting the existing streambed and surrounding ecosystem.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. possible
Work Plan	9/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	6/12
Budget	5/5		
Schedule	5/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	6/12
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	5/5	Program Preferences	8/10
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			44

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The criterion is less than fully addressed and is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. As the project is at 30% design stage, no plans and specifications are included with the application. The maps included provide some conceptual level understanding of the project. In addition, while the applicant provides a good discussion on the "Purpose and Need" of the proposal, no information is provided on the sewer relocation component of the proposal which is not introduced until Tasks 5 and 9 of the Work Plan, making it difficult to clearly understand how these tasks are related to the Project. Although the two components in the proposal might be somewhat correlated, the information provided is inadequate to determine to what extent. Furthermore, the project location maps do not show either the

existing sewer or the proposed relocation route and its connection with the storm drain. The proposal includes listing of required permits and environmental (CEQA) compliance requirements, studies, and technical and scientific information that support the feasibility of the project.

Budget

The Budget has detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4; the costs are reasonable, and all the Budget categories of Exhibit B are thoroughly supported. The proposal includes a summary Budget, well prepared comprehensive cost breakdowns for each of the Budget categories, and supporting explanations of how project costs were estimated.

Schedule

Although the project is at 30% design stage, the Schedule seems to be reasonable and demonstrates a readiness to begin the project no later than six months after the anticipated award date (October 1, 2011). The applicant presents a Schedule that is detailed, specific, and adequately documents the proposal. For example, the information provided for Attachment 5 includes a Schedule that shows: Task start and end dates, project milestones, task dependencies, and Schedule that is presented in Gantt chart format.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

This criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well presented documentation and logical rationales. The project is consistent with the applicable basin plan and does not adversely impact present and potential beneficial uses. The applicant adequately describes where and what data will be collected, as well as how the data will be analyzed and used to monitor project performance. A performance measures Table is also included for detailing outcomes and outputs and targets that are achievable. The listed output indicators should effectively track output and outcome indicators are adequate to evaluate the with-project benefits.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits

Average level of Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply benefits can be realized through this proposal. The quality of the analysis is partially lacking and supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. In particular, no inundation map is shown. Total net present value (NPV) of costs is \$18.95 million. FDR claimed benefits are \$1.817 million. The total avoided cost of about \$12 million appears to be an upper estimate of total FDR benefits with little or no water supply benefit.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Average level of Water Quality and Other Expected benefits can be realized through this proposal. However, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and/or supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. Water quality and other benefits of \$11.94 million are claimed. This is primarily an avoided cost (\$17.39 million) of relocating the Palo Verdes Drive east (PVDE) in 2019 with a NPV of about \$9.7 million. However, from Attachment 8, PVDE could apparently be stabilized using CIDH at a cost of about \$2 million.

Program Preferences

The proposal demonstrates with a significant degree of certainty that a number of Program Preferences can be achieved by implementing the proposed project. Thorough documentation with breadth and magnitude is provided for the following Program Preferences: Include Regional Projects or Programs; Effectively Resolve Significant Water-Related Conflicts within or between Regions; Practice Integrated Flood Management; Protect Surface and Groundwater Quality; and Expand Environmental Stewardship.